

REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 and 11 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Dedene et al. (US 7,176,867). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the features of a light-emitting device comprising a first light-emitting element for emitting a red color, a second light-emitting element for emitting a green color, and a third light-emitting element for emitting a blue color¹. Further, Applicants are amending Claim 1 to recites the feature that luminescence passing the first electrode and luminescence passing the second electrode are the same in a color coordinate. These features are supported by, for example, page 7, line 21 to page 9, line 4; page 12, lines 1-15 of the specification; and Figs. 1, 4A and 4B of the present application.

Applicants further note that in Claim 1, the first light-emitting element includes a transparent first electrode and a transparent second electrode. The first light-emitting element can emit a red light through the first electrode and the second electrode simultaneously. Similarly, the second light-emitting element includes a transparent third electrode and a transparent fourth electrode and can emit a green light through the third electrode and the fourth electrode simultaneously. Also, the third light-emitting element includes a transparent fifth

¹ The other claims are being amended to make them consistent with Claim 1, and/or to clarify the claimed invention and remove informalities in the claims.

electrode and a transparent sixth electrode and can emit a blue light through the fifth electrode and the sixth electrode simultaneously.

In contrast, Dedene discloses in Col. 6, lines 30-34 (relied upon by the Examiner in the office action), “a first transparent electrode 4” and “a second electrode 8.” Hence, with Dedene, the light can only emit through the first transparent electrode 4. Dedene also discloses in Col. 6, lines 54-62 (also relied upon by the Examiner in the office action), “a first electrode 4” and “a second transparent electrode 8.” Hence, in this case, the light can only emit through the second transparent electrode 4. Therefore, the display disclosed in Dedene can only emit through one side of the first electrode 4 or the second electrode 8. Dedene does not disclose or suggest the structure of the device of Claim 1.

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Dedene, and Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Dedene. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by Dedene in view of Ryu (US 5,507,404). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claims 2 and 13 recite the feature of “two color filters which sandwich the light-emitting element.” In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to concede that Dedene does not disclose this claimed feature. As a result, the Examiner cites Ryu and contends that “Ryu teaches a related EL display device comprising an upper color filter 201, a middle light emitting layer 104, and a lower color filter 102, fig. 2, col. 4, lines 15-20.”

However, in contrast to the Examiner's contention, Ryu discloses in col.4, lines 15-20, "a color filter 201" and "the metal electrode 102." In the color EL display disclosed in Fig. 2 in Ryu, the metal electrode 102 does not function as a color filter. Rather Ryu discloses in Col.3, lines 54-57 that "The light traveling to rear side of the EL display element is reflected from the metal electrode 102 to user, resulting in improvement of the brightness of the EL display element". Hence, Ryu does not disclose or suggest the claimed feature of "two color filters which sandwich the light-emitting element" and cannot operate in the same manner as the claimed invention.

Therefore, Ryu does not disclose or suggest the claimed features of independent Claims 2 and 13, and Claims 2 and 13 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Ryu. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 14, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO, CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568